Ham-Policy Digest   Sun, 6 Nov 94   Volume 94 : Issue 521

Today's Topics:
                         CW: Law or Choice ?
            NoCal OO goes after Packet BULLetins (2 msgs)
        Open Letter to Jeff Herman was Re: Deleting Richard Cris
                    Re: Questions on this and that
                        shave-and-a-haircut

Date: Thu, 3 Nov 94 18:27:32 GMT
From: jcumming@dgim.doc.ca (Jim Cummings)
Subject: CW: Law or Choice ?

kevin jessup (kevin.jessup@mixcom.mixcom.com) wrote:
: In <1994Oct31.175418.26826@clark.dgim.doc.ca> jcumming@dgim.doc.ca (Jim
Cummings) writes:

: >I wonder what would happen if the points awards from each CW contact were
: >reduced to 1 point instead of the current 2 points would have an effect?
: >Some would say no, but I think otherwise.

: I agree. I've heard no shortage of comments here about how great
: CW is at cutting through the QRM, QRN and the like. And let's
: not forget how God-awful efficient it is as far a bandwidth too.

Yes, I agree Kevin -- these mantras are trotted out as the pathway to
radio Nirvanha. There is no sense in pointing out these

no-longer-existing fallicies. The reaction is similar to the denials of
once popular TV evangelists - denial accompanied with fire and damnation
of the accuser. However, we all know which one did time in the
Crowbar Hotel. Despite all the claimed bowing and scraping to the great
god of advancement of amateur radio, many of those who continue to extohl
the virtues of CW as the one means of equating ham radio with eternal
happiness.

: In that light, why is the BEST mode of communication given the
: most amount of points? Should not the opposite be true? At the
: very least, should not ALL modes stand on their own merit and
: receive equivalent points?

: CW affirmative action: when will it end?

Perhaps there should be a discussion as to whether the ARRL should
re-assign the same point value to CW as it does to phone. If it is so
efficient, then it shouldn't matter, stations will use it on its own
merits. Otherwise, it is bribery.

: >73 and live better digitally

: I love it! I feel a new (and borrowed) sig comming on! :-))
: At least time and technology is on the side of us digital weenies!!

: >Jim, VE3XJ

: Kevin, N9SQB, amateur radio and political Libertarian

Again, 73 and live better digitally

Jim, VE3XJ

Date: 3 Nov 1994 17:41:05 -0800
From: rwilkins@ccnet.com (Bob Wilkins n6fri)
Subject: NoCal OO goes after Packet BULLetins

Steve Wolf (sww@csuohio.edu) wrote:

: But is is broadcasting none the less.

: I think it was Todd Little that that quoted the definition of broadcasting.

: From Part 97.3(a) ... (10) ... Broadcasting - Transmissions intended for
: reception by the general public, either direct or relayed.

: Clearly, a BBS phone port with a annonymous check-in allows the public access
: to relayed transmissions. There are LOTS of phone ports that allow
: anonymous check-ins.

: So, originators of bulletins which are sent by any means to a BBS that has
: a public phone port that are not about amateur radio would fall under
: broadcasting.

: Broadcasting does not require a one-way transmission. It would appear that
: an ax.25 connection between two stations can still be use for broadcasting.

: (Bet we are going to move on and say that a bulletin about quilting was
: targeted solely at the amateur population. Let me guess ... ANY bulletin
: entered on packet is to be assumed to be aimed solely at the amateur radio
: population.)

I can't tell if I am a victim of dry Cleaveland humor or you are truly
serious...

In the event you are serious in your interpretations of the rules, do you
plan to close down your operations on tcp/ip and public pbbs stations?

Following your logic even a personal third party message in transit
through your stations that could be seen by a non-amateur scanner
enthusiast with a tnc would then be considered broadcasting. Many members
of the All Ohio Scanner Club use tncs for entertainment and information
gathering. Since it is your station that is being received by the public.
why is the originating station in California guilty of Broadcasting?

I hope you never have to provide emergency message service to the public
during a disaster. Many amateur groups set up packet stations at Malls to
provide Health and Welfare messages to the public so they can contact
family and friends outside the disaster area. This is an Amateur Service
that has always provided good will to the public. Doing this in front of
the public and even allowing the public to type their short messages into
a computer is a broadcasting violation of your interpretation. Are you sure?

Most of us try to interpret the rules to allow us the most latitude in
operating our stations even bending them a little to allow new modes of
communications.

Hank is right when he talks about unconnected UI frames. I have seen many
Beacon Broadcasts that could be reasonably called broadcasts as defined.
These beacons are generaly of the non amateur _Save our State_ or _Jesus
Saves_ or _Pro Gun_ types of quasi-political slogans. This is the area
that the OOs and ARRL need to address and educate within our ranks.

Lets see ... I have set my Beacon Text to _Cookies are good with Milk_ and

I am digipeating this every seven minutes through four digipeaters in the
area. Who is violating which rules?

Bob

--
     Bob Wilkins   work   bwilkins@cave.org
 Berkeley, California   home   rwilkins@ccnet.com
     94701-0710   play   n6fri@n6eeg.#nocal.ca.usa.noam

Date: Fri, 4 Nov 1994 08:47:48 GMT
From: n6rky@netcom.com (William A. Wetzel)
Subject: NoCal OO goes after Packet BULLetins

After reading some of the postings on packet bulletins being considered as
broadcasting.... WHAT KIND OF DRUGS ARE THESE PEOPLE ON???? A bulletin for
packet radio is not a broadcast to the general public. In packet radio, it
is UI frames which are considered as a form of broadcasting. Nodes use the
UI frames to broadcast routing tables to each other.

Now if someone was posting a message on a BBS "intended" to be read by the
NON-HAM population.... THIS IS BROADCASTING AS DEFINED BY THE F.C.C. It is
not about technical definitions here.... IT IS LEGAL DEFINITIONS. And that
includes intent people!

If intent was not it, a beacon saying "HAVE A NICE DAY" would qualify as a
violation by some of our mentally challenged packet police out here :) The
subject is not all that hard to understand. If I want to read about a good
way to make cookies on a packet BBS, I that is my choice. If I offered the
sale of my house to other hams, that is my choice. BUT if I offered to the
general public the sale of my home on a packet BBS - guess what? That is a
violation! PLAIN AND SIMPLE!! Do all you packet cops get the picture now??

                                        73 de William, N6RKY.
N6RKY @ N6RKY.WF6O.#SOCA.CA.USA.NA
N6RKY @ NETCOM.COM Internet E-mail

Date: Wed, 2 Nov 1994 04:40:22 GMT
From: jeffrey@kahuna.tmc.edu (Jeffrey Herman)
Subject: Open Letter to Jeff Herman was Re: Deleting Richard Cris

In article <crispCyLJC7.LE@netcom.com> crisp@netcom.com (Richard Crisp) writes:

>Hey Jeff, what does this rot have to do with shortwave?

Rich: I was responding to Paul Schleck's slanderous statements
here on rec.radio.amateur.policy - ask him why *he* cross-posted it
to .policy, .shortwave, and .scanner. Hopefully, now you can understand
the confusion and noise that may result from cross-posting.

Jeff

Date: Mon, 31 Oct 1994 23:20:47 GMT
From: Earl=Morse%EMC=Srvc%Eng=Hou@bangate.compaq.com
Subject: Re: Questions on this and that

>In article <38v7pf$f8e@jupiter.planet.net>,
>Bill Sohl Budd Lake <billsohl@earth.planet.net> wrote:
>>
>>This (the shave & a haircut story) sounds like pure myth to me.
>>Anyone have any actual references (i.e. QST articles/story) to
>>back up this claim? Not meant as a flame, just want to
>>validate this story.
>
>Hi Bill, I can tell it like it was in the early 50's when I was a Novice
>(WN5DXP). The shave-and-a-haircut...six-bits thing was not used in place
>of a CQ. It was used only at the very end of a CW QSO after both stations
>had signed their 73's. It went like this:
>
>Station#1: ... 73 73 shave-and-a-haircut
>
>Station#2: six-bits shave-and-a-haircut
>
>Station#1: six-bits
>
>Over the years the shave-and-a-haircut part has been dropped and only the
>six-bits part remains. But in the early 50's, the majority of Novices signed
>as Stations 1 & 2 above. I've never heard shave-and-a-haircut used in place
>of CQ but I was inactive on CW from the mid-50's to the mid-80's.

Sounds right to me. We were doing this in the novice bands in the late 70's
and early 80s.

Earl Morse
KZ8E
kz8e@bangate.compaq.com

Date: Sat, 5 Nov 1994 12:20:48 GMT
From: jeffrey@kahuna.tmc.edu (Jeffrey Herman)
Subject: shave-and-a-haircut

Ah, more evidence for the skeptics. But I wonder how this anecdotal
thread split onto two newsgroups. I've asked K5FO to tell his version.
I get the feeling that no callsigns were exchanged during this psuedo
CQ and answer - that certainly might explain the FCC's reaction.

Waltk@pica.army.mil writes over on .misc:

>It was my experience in the mid-late 60's that this (. ... .) was not only
>in bad taste, but was illegal. You had to log every CQ and identify every
>transmission. I was warned often about this practice when I was a novice
>and therefore never used it myself (fingers crossed). But, it did become the
>defacto CQ in the novice bands. It saved bandwidth and was a heck of lot
>easier to send than those gawd-awfull 2x3 callsigns we were assigned. But,
>soon thereafter we upgraded, moved to SSB and forgot CW, all together.
>
>See y'all in SS this weekend.
>
>...
>73 de Walt Kornienko -   K2WK   Internet: waltk@pica.army.mil
>DX PacketCluster: K2WK > W3MM   Packet: K2WK@N2ERH.NJ.USA.NOAM
>ex-WN2WID, WB2WID
><> Member: Franford Radio Club <<<>>> #1 Contest Club In The World <>
>_____

Jeff NH6IL

End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #521
****